

1  
2 WHEREFORE, petitioner King County prays that judicial  
3 review of the decision and order of the Pollution Control  
4 Hearings Board be granted and that the court reverse that  
5 decision and order.

6 DATED this 10<sup>th</sup> day of December, 1984.

7  
8 NORM MALENG  
King County Prosecuting Attorney

9  
10  
11 By: 

12 JACK G. JOHNSON  
13 Deputy Prosecuting Attorney  
Attorneys for Petitioner  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

NOTICE OF APPEAL - 2

NORM MALENG  
Prosecuting Attorney  
CIVIL DIVISION  
E 550 King County Courthouse  
Seattle Washington 98104  
(206) 583-4437

1 complaints of offensive odor. Respondent exercised its discretion  
2 reasonably in noting a violation and assessing a \$250 penalty for each  
3 incident (March 8 and 9, 1984).

4 VI

5 Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law is  
6 hereby adopted as such.

7 From these Conclusions, the Board enters this  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,  
27 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER  
PCHB Nos. 84-100 & 84-101

1 non-conforming permits must be renewed or replaced periodically, as  
2 the operating authority shows increasing ability to meet minimum  
3 standards and other state and local regulations or else develops a  
4 schedule for site closure or change-over. We conclude this because  
5 WAC 173-301-180(2) and (3) states:

6 (2) the disposal site or facility shall be  
7 located, designed, constructed, operated and  
8 maintained so as to prevent the creation of a  
9 nuisance, and shall comply with all state and local  
10 requirements including but not limited to, if  
11 applicable, zoning, land use, fire protection, water  
12 pollution prevention, air pollution prevention and  
13 esthetics. (Emphasis added.)

14 (3) The owner and/or occupant of any premise  
15 shall be responsible for the satisfactory and legal  
16 disposal of solid wastes generated by his activity.

17 A landfill site must find itself in conformance with all pertinent  
18 regulations and laws, or be on a schedule of compliance (reflected in  
19 its planning and budget documents and permits) which will bring it  
20 into conformity with environmental and land use regulations.

21 There was no evidence presented showing King County to be on a  
22 compliance schedule for meeting minimum standards of pertinent  
23 environmental regulations. There was testimony that King County has  
24 hopes for improvement in 1985 and 1986. These hopes do not remove the  
25 County's responsibility for air pollution control now or on March 8  
26 and 9, of this year.

27 V

28 The Notices of Civil Penalty issued to King County for violations  
29 of both Regulation I and the Washington Administrative Code were the  
30 first issued to the subject landfill site and were based on verified

31 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,  
32 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER  
33 PCHB Nos. 84-100 & 84-101

1 duration as is, or is likely to be, injurious to  
2 human health, plant or animal life, or property, or  
3 which unreasonably interferes with enjoyment of life  
4 and property.

5 On March 8 and 9, 1984, late in the day offensive odors emanating  
6 from the Cedar Hills Landfill site wafted onto residential properties  
7 causing persons there to flee indoors and experience nausea and  
8 headaches; a circumstance which unreasonably interfered with enjoyment  
9 of life and property.

#### 10 IV

11 King County endeavors to operate the subject landfill site in  
12 accordance with its permits and certain applicable laws and  
13 regulations. Among the pertinent regulations are those at chapter  
14 173-301-304 WAC.

15 Sanitary landfill, leachate control--Daily cover.  
16 The compacted solid waste shall be compacted and  
17 covered fully with at least six inches of compacted  
18 soil after each day of operation, or as specified by  
19 the jurisdictional health department, and department  
20 of ecology.

21 The King County Health District issued the subject landfill a  
22 non-conforming permit because of King County's assertions that it  
23 cannot now operate the site to meet minimum standards set forth in WAC  
24 173-301 (solid waste handling), particularly at 173-301-304.<sup>1</sup> Such

- 
- 25 1. Operations under a non-conforming permit may have invited odor  
26 problems at Cedar Hills, which then appeared like an unwanted  
27 dinner guest. Ridding the area of such guest appearances  
undoubtedly will require changes in operations, some portion of  
which comes about through new equipment and additional personnel.

1 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

2 I

3 The Board has jurisdiction over these persons and these matters.  
4 RCW 43.21B.

5 II

6 Regional air pollution control authorities and the Washington  
7 State Department of Ecology are empowered to implement the Clean Air  
8 Act through regulations found in the Washington Administrative Code at  
9 Chapter 173-400. WAC 173-400-040(5) prohibits the emission of air  
10 contaminants which are detrimental to persons or property, as stated  
11 here:

12 (5) Emission of air contaminants detrimental to  
13 persons or property. No person shall cause or permit  
14 the emission of any air contaminant from any source,  
15 including any air contaminant whose emission is not  
16 otherwise prohibited by this chapter, if the air  
contaminant causes detriment to the health, safety,  
or welfare of any person, or causes damage to  
property or business.

17 A malodorous emission of fumes or gas [odor carrying fractions in  
18 methane gas, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), and fumes from exposed leachate]  
19 which wafts onto neighboring property and interferes with persons'  
20 well-being and with those persons' use of their property is an  
21 emission prohibited under the above-cited WAC chapter and subsection.

22 III

23 Likewise, under terms of Section 9.11(a) of PSAPCA Regulation I  
24 certain air emissions are also prohibited.

25 (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to cause  
26 or allow the emission of any air contaminant in  
sufficient quantities and of such characteristics and

1 One expert in air pollution control engineering, who is under  
2 contract with the County Prosecuting Attorney for odor evaluation of  
3 King County landfills, testified that with methods of odor detection  
4 he used on several occasions at Cedar Hills he only detected an odor  
5 off-site once. He was not at the site or in its vicinity on March 8  
6 or 9, 1984, however. This same expert testified to three primary, or  
7 notable, sources of odor at landfills: a) fresh garbage, b)  
8 decomposing garbage (fractions of which are in waste gas), and c)  
9 leachate (the liquid seeping out of decomposing garbage). He asserted  
10 the most pervasive odor at any particular site was likely to be the  
11 decomposing garbage and further testified that one cannot exactly  
12 predict from on-site whether or which of these odors will be  
13 detectable off-site at any particular moment.

14 IX

15 The respondent PSAPCA evaluated the complaints and inspectors'  
16 reports and issued two formal notices; Notice and Order of Civil  
17 Penalty No. 5986 and No. 5987, on April 12, 1984. Each notice charged  
18 a violation of WAC 173-400-040(5) and Section 9.11(a) of Regulation I  
19 and levied a \$250 penalty (totalling \$500). Feeling aggrieved by  
20 this, King County appealed these actions to the Board on May 17, 1984.

21 X

22 Any Conclusion of Law which is deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby  
23 adopted as such.

24 From these Findings of Fact, the Board comes to these  
25

26 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,  
27 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER  
PCHB Nos. 84-100 & 84-101

VII

The County tries to control waste gas, leachate, and odors at the site through a program of strategic garbage piling, piping of gas and liquid, and flaming-off of waste gas. The Public Works Department states it needs more piping and flame burners and plans to install same. The Department also has petitioned for County funds for 1985 to purchase new and better scrappers, bulldozers and waste transfer equipment for the Cedar Hills site.

The age of the landfill, the occasional overnight exposure of garbage, and the limited equipment available for handling both fresh and decomposing garbage have apparently caused the site to be more difficult to manage in recent years. Consequently, it is not surprising that both new and long-time neighbors might experience and report an incidence of offensive odors. Both the County government and the complaining neighbors testified to a need to improve the operation of the site. The point of departure is their differing sense of urgency and their command of resources to solve the problem(s).

VIII

The sniff action scale utilized by PSAPCA is one of several common methods of odor measurement. The science of measurement and evaluation of odor is rooted in human perceptions, which perceptions vary according to age, gender, smoking habits, and general health. There are both regulatory and medical aspects to odor evaluation; evident in each evaluation instrument.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER  
PCHB Nos. 84-100 & 84-101

1 Act and all pertinent implementing regulations in the administrative  
2 code, in addition to other laws or codes under which they operate.

3 V

4 On March 8 and 9, 1984, residents of the nearby neighborhood  
5 complained late in the day to respondent Agency of noxious odors  
6 interfering with their enjoyment of their property and making them ill.

7 An inspector from respondent PSAPCA came each day to the affected  
8 homesites and verified offensive odors between a two and three in  
9 intensity when measured on a sniff action scale of one to four (four  
10 being the most offensive, that which is so overpowering as to drive a  
11 person from the site). The inspections determined the odor was one of  
12 garbage, perhaps rotting garbage. A look at the Cedar Hills Landfill  
13 the evening of March 8, 1984, showed exposed garbage along the eastern  
14 border of the landfill site, one-half mile away from one complainant's  
15 home. There was a slight wind coming out of the west on that occasion.

16 The complainants testified the odor on those two days made them  
17 nauseated and forced them to stay indoors. They felt particularly  
18 impacted by the odor in the evenings. They additionally report they  
19 experience odors in the early morning sometimes and one long-time  
20 resident who complained on March 8 and 9 recalled he did not remember  
21 smelling such odors seven years ago and earlier.

22 VI

23 The Maple Valley area by the subject site is sparsely settled and  
24 is largely forested. The perceived garbage waste odors of March 8 and  
25 9 could only have emanated from the Cedar Hills Landfill site.

26 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,  
27 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER  
PCHB Nos. 84-100 & 84-101



1 and one-half hours a day, is patrolled at night, and is open all  
2 seasons of the year, receiving 2,600 tons of residential and  
3 commercial garbage annually.

### 4 III

5 The landfill is publicly operated and is governed by requirements  
6 of the King County Health District, some of whose requirements are an  
7 implementation of Washington Administrative Code regulations at  
8 173-301 WAC. The site operates under a non-conforming permit which  
9 does not mandate full over-covering of garbage at all times.

10 The landfill operators manage the ultimate disposal of garbage in  
11 a fashion which will achieve dirt coverage of the waste therein as  
12 often as possible, commensurate with available funds, equipment, and  
13 personnel. In 1984, \$900,000 is scheduled to be spent for garbage  
14 covering at the subject site, and approximately \$5,000,000 is spent  
15 annually to operate the entire landfill.

16 Despite the current attempts to manage the site to achieve waste  
17 coverage, some notorious odors emanate from the landfill and waft  
18 across the site boundaries into a neighborhood nearby. Such odors may  
19 be either from new garbage or decomposing garbage waste which exists  
20 under anerobic conditions.

### 21 IV

22 Appellants assert the landfill site may, therefore, not fall under  
23 the authority of the respondent PSAPCA and its Regulation I or the  
24 Washington Clean Air Act, at 70.94 RCW. Respondent Agency asserts the  
25 Cedar Hills Landfill must comply with Regulation I and the Clean Air

1 Lacey, Washington. Seated for and as the Board were Lawrence J. Faulk  
2 and Gayle Rothrock (presiding). The proceedings were officially  
3 reported by Nancy Swenson. Respondent elected a formal hearing  
4 pursuant to RCW 43.21B.230.

5 Appellants were represented by Darrell Syferd and Michael  
6 Linnaberry, Deputy Prosecuting Attorneys for King County. Respondent  
7 Agency was represented by its attorney Keith D. McGoffin.

8 Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were entered.  
9 Argument was heard and briefed. From the testimony, evidence, and  
10 contentions of the parties, the Board makes these

11 FINDINGS OF FACT

12 I

13 Respondent PSAPCA, pursuant to RCW 43.21B.260, has filed with this  
14 Board a certified copy of its Regulation I, and all amendments  
15 thereto, which is noticed.

16 II

17 Appellant King County owns and operates a sanitary landfill--the  
18 Cedar Hills Landfill--located at 16645-228th Avenue SE, Maple Valley,  
19 Washington. They have owned and operated the site since 1964 through  
20 their Department of Public Works, Division of Solid Waste. The Solid  
21 Waste Division operates six transfer stations, waste transfer  
22 vehicles, some rural landfills and the subject landfill site.

23 Waste and garbage is ultimately brought to the subject site,  
24 compacted, piled, covered, and its gas vented from 15 active flare  
25 jets. The site is actively operated seven days a week at least eight

26 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,  
27 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER  
PCHB Nos. 84-100 & 84-101

BEFORE THE  
POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD  
STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN THE MATTER OF  
KING COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF  
PUBLIC WORKS, SOLID WASTE  
DIVISION,

Appellant,

v.

PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION  
CONTROL AGENCY,

Respondent,

and

STATE OF WASHINGTON,  
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,

Intervenor.

PCHB Nos. 84-100 and  
84-101

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND  
ORDER

This matter, the appeal of two Notices of Violation and \$500 in civil penalties for allowing the emission of an air contaminant from the Cedar Hills Landfill site in the Maple Valley-Issaquah area, came on for hearing before the Pollution Control Hearings Board on September 27, 1984, at Seattle, Washington, and on October 5, 1984, at